

Is islam peaceful?

'Al-Mughira replied.. **"Our prophet, the messenger of our lord, has ordered us to fight you til you worship allah alone or give jizya (tax levied exclusively upon non-muslims); and our prophet has informed us that our lord says:**

"Whoever amongst us is killed (i.e. martyred), shall go to paradise to lead such a luxurious life as he has never seen, and whoever amongst us remain alive, shall become your master."

- **Sahih al-Bukhari 3159, 3160**

Islam is a religion of peace. We've all heard it. The media and our politicians make sure that we never forget it.

In the aftermath of the 9/11 terrorist attacks, George W. Bush reassured the American public, and by extension the entirety of the western world, that:

'The face of terror is not the true faith of Islam. That's not what Islam is all about. Islam is peace.'

Islam is peace.

If islam is a peaceful ideology, one could reasonably expect to find an abundance of verses extolling the virtues of peace, tolerance and understanding in the book that muslims believe is the final word of the one true god, the quran.

The quran is a book composed of 114 chapters, called *surahs*. Each surah is made up of an x amount of verses, called *ayat* (a single verse is known as an *ayah*).

We are told that the quran is a truly enlightened book that teaches peace, love, tolerance and respect. We are told that we ought to respect it in turn.

What part of the quran exactly are people referring to when they tell us that it preaches peace? The six ayat of Surah Al-Kufirun? The sixth and final ayah succinctly summarises that surah: 'You have your way, and I have my way' (109:6).

That sounds reasonably tolerant, but if that is what the quran truly teaches, then why are we constantly seeing reports of mass murder and terrorism committed in the name of islam?

This is where the islamic concept of *naskh* (abrogation) comes into play. Naskh is the practice of abiding by, or affording preference to, the ayah (verse) revealed closer to the end of Muhammed's prophetic career when confronted with two or more seemingly contradictory ayat. For example, gambling and the use of intoxicants were originally deemed halal, or permissible (2:219, 4:43), before later being classed as haram, or impermissible (5:90).

Muslims throughout history have followed, and continue to follow, the teachings of the latter ayah, revealed closer to the end of Muhammed's prophetic career.

Interestingly, the 114 surahs (chapters) that together compile the quran are not arranged chronologically, rather, they are simply arranged from the longest surah to the shortest. A chronological listing of the surahs, approved by scholarly consensus, although still debated, can be viewed at www.tanzil.net.

It is important to note that the aforementioned 'peaceful and tolerant' Surah Al-Kafirun that muslims refer to was the eighteenth surah revealed, and it was revealed in Mecca, where Muhammed was not in control of a formidable fighting force and was already quite unpopular due to him telling anyone who did not abandon their polytheistic beliefs and join his new monotheistic cult that they would be condemned to eternal torture in the hellfire, trapped in an endless cycle of having their skin burned off, replaced, and then burned off again (4:54).

The ayah that I shall now quote is the twenty ninth ayah of Surah At-Tawba, which was the penultimate surah revealed to Muhammed. The instructions given to muslims in this ayah supersede any prior ayat promoting a 'live and let live' attitude towards the kuffir (derogatory term for non-muslims).

'Fight those who believe not in allah nor the last day, nor hold that forbidden which hath been forbidden by allah and his messenger, nor acknowledge the religion of truth, (even if they are) of the people of the book, until they pay the jizya with willing submission, and feel themselves subdued.'

So, here we have an ayah commanding muslims to fight and subjugate every non-muslim the world over, even the people of the book (islamic term for christians and jews), until they either convert to islam or submit to muslim rule, live lives greatly influenced by the sharia, and pay the jizya (tax levied solely upon non-muslims) as a humiliation, marking them as second class citizens.

I understand that there will be many muslims and apologists just waiting to shout me down and convince me and my fellow ignorant kuffir that the jizya is not a humiliation at all, how dare I say that! Rather, the jizya is a kindness to the poor, weak kuffir. It guarantees us 'protection' and exempts us from paying zakat (wealth tax that muslims pay).

So I shall quote from Ibn Kathir's (a renowned 14th century islamic scholar) commentary on the ayah:

'Paying jizya is a sign of kufr and disgrace.'

Under islamic dominion, non-muslims are not directly governed by the sharia. They may resolve inter-faith disputes between themselves however they see fit, so long as the ruling does not directly contradict or violate the sharia.

However, non-muslims are subject to a ludicrously restrictive set of rulings that dictate, amongst other things, that:

- A non-muslims must surrender their seat to a muslim when demanded.
- Non-muslim children must not be taught the quran.
- No new churches or temples may be built, or existing churches or temples repaired, within the caliphate.
- Non-muslims must not own or carry weapons of any kind.
- Non-muslims must not sell certain products which are forbidden to muslims, including wine and other alcoholic beverages, at markets.
- That non-muslims must not 'imitate the muslims' in their attire or speech.
- That non-muslims must not openly display religious symbols or non-islamic texts which they regard as sacred.
- That non-muslims must not chant or sing loudly at burials, and must not carry candles or torches through the streets during funeral processions.

The aforementioned restrictions are derived from the 'pact of Umar', a series of protocols that were originally forced upon the conquered christian and jewish denizens of seventh century Syria and Palestine by the conquering muslim Arab forces of Umar I, and still today serve as the islamic blueprint for how conquered non-muslims ought to be treated by their muslim suzerains (see the Boston University webpage entitled: 'Islam and the Jews: The pact of Umar, 9th century CE').

Umar had been Muhammed's friend and father in law, and after Muhammed's death he played a prominent role in the rapidly expanding caliphate, eventually succeeding Abu Bakr to become the second caliph.

In 2014/15, I.S (formerly ISIS), the notorious islamic militia, gave their newly conquered non-muslim subjects in Iraq and northern Syria an ultimatum. I paraphrase:

'Immediately pay us jizya and agree to abide by the oppressive and humiliating 'covenant' (as they called it) that we shall impose upon you, or abandon your livelihoods, vacate your homes, and leave ISIS controlled territories at once.'

The islamic militants proceeded to ransack and demolish historic christian churches, and deface or destroy christian monuments.

The 'covenant' which they forced upon their non-muslim victims was practically a verbatim replica of the seventh century sunnah inspired 'pact' attributed to Umar I.

A diminutive coterie of islamic scholars have decreed it acceptable that christians may build new churches in christian majority villages within muslim controlled territories, although this minority opinion directly contradicts the scholarly consensus and historical precedent.

So, muslims invade and conquer a non-muslim land, terrorise and subjugate its people, and only allow them to live in a state of quasi-peace if they abandon their ancestral beliefs and customs, or yield and agree to pay protection money to their new muslim overlords?

Did Tony Soprano just expand his territory?

The muslims 'protect' the kuffir of the caliphate in much the same way that organised crime groups 'protect' small businesses in their neighbourhoods.

By that I mean:

'Pay up, live in fear of us, and allow us to openly disrespect you and your community or else things will get violent.'

The kuffir are seen as dirt on a muslim's shoe. It's written plainly in islamic scripture, they don't attempt to hide it.

'Indeed, they who disbelieved among the People of the Scripture and the polytheists will be in the fire of Hell, abiding eternally therein. Those are the worst of creatures.'

(98:6)

Is this what your muslim 'friends' and neighbours are taught in your local masjid?

I write 'friends' because the quran explicitly forbids muslims from truly befriending disbelievers numerous times in the quran (60:1, 4:144, 5:51, 8:73, 3:28).

Let's examine the ayah 3:28. This ayah is from Surah Aal-i-Imraan, which was revealed in Medina towards the end of Muhammed's prophethood.

'Let not the believers take disbelievers for their friends in preference to believers. Whoso doeth that hath no connection with allah unless (it be) that ye but guard yourselves against them, taking (as it were) security. Allah biddeth you beware (only) of himself. Unto allah is the journeying.'

So, a muslim should not befriend non-muslims, if he does so he is deemed to be a hypocrite who has a 'painful punishment' awaiting him in the hereafter (4:138-139). A muslim may only take non-muslims for friends if it is as a preemptive, protective measure if he/she is in a land where there is not a dominant muslim presence.

Ibn Kathir clarifies the ayah in his tafsir (quranic commentary):

'...meaning, except those believers who in some areas or times fear for their safety from the disbelievers. In this case, such **believers are allowed to show friendship to the disbelievers outwardly, but never inwardly. For instance, Al-Bukhari recorded that Abu Ad-Darda' said, "We smile in the face of some people although our hearts curse them."** Al-Bukhari said that Al-Hasan said, "The Tuqyah is allowed until the Day of Resurrection."

Is this what is being taught to young muslim children in Ireland?

Next, let's look at the ayat 5:32 and 5:33.

The first of these two ayat is commonly quoted by both muslims and islamic apologists alike in their respective attempts to paint islam as an inherently just and benevolent ideology that strives towards peace and non-violence.

It reads as follows:

5:32

‘On that account: We ordained for the children of Israel that if any one slew a person - unless it be for murder or for spreading mischief in the land - it would be as if he slew the whole people: and if any one saved a life, it would be as if he saved the life of the whole people. Then although there came to them our messengers with clear signs, yet, even after that, many of them continued to commit excesses in the land.’

At first glance, this ayah seems to be promoting pacifism and the ceasing of unnecessary killing. It was even quoted by King Charles III of the United Kingdom, before his succession to the crown , at a charity dinner in 2009.

Alas, when we consult the tafsirs (quranic commentaries by respected islamic scholars), we learn that it is in fact an ayah condoning the killing of apostates and those enemies of the state who hold and voice dissenting opinions.

Let’s keep reading.

5:33

‘The punishment of those who wage war against allah and his messenger, and strive with might and main for mischief through the land is: execution, or crucifixion, or the cutting off of hands and feet from opposite sides, or exile from the land: that is their disgrace in this world, and a heavy punishment is theirs in the hereafter.’

Ouch.

We must now determine what exactly constitutes ‘waging war against allah and his messenger’ and ‘spreading mischief in the land’, those heinous crimes that warrant such gruesome punishments as described in 5:33.

Ibn Kathir clarifies for us in his tafsir:

‘Wage war’ mentioned here means, oppose and contradict, and it includes disbelief, blocking roads and spreading fear in the fairways. Mischief in the land refers to various types of evil.’

So for one to be considered as ‘waging war against allah and his messenger’ and to potentially be sentenced to execution by crucifixion or otherwise, or having a hand and foot of one’s chopped off on alternative sides, or banishment, a person must only apostasize, publicly denounce or disbelieve in islam, or oppose or contradict a ruling of the quran/sunnah (the sunnah is the name given to the sum of the collections of recorded hadith, sayings and doings of the prophet Muhammed, which give context to the quran).

Homosexual men must also be considered to be 'waging war against allah and his messenger', as Muhammed himself is reported to have ordered all homosexual men to be killed (Sunan Ibn Majah 2561). This is why we still see the public executions of alleged homosexual men in muslim majority countries today, as well as the execution-style murder of homosexuals by muslims in non-muslim majority countries.

Sadly, Ireland has already experienced such religiously motivated murders, with the gruesome killings of Aidan Moffitt, who suffered a total of forty two stab wounds and was decapitated in his own home, and Michael Snee, who had been stabbed a total of twenty five times in his own home, both in Sligo in April of 2022.

A third man, whom I will not name, was also attacked and stabbed by the murderer, Yousef Palani, the day before he killed Aidan Moffitt. The victim survived, but unfortunately lost sight in one eye as a result of the assault.

Yousef was, at the time, a twenty three year old practising muslim who spoke to the gardai of how islam forbids homosexuality, yet somehow investigators were 'satisfied that he was not radicalised'.

Let us return now to the seventh century, when another enemy of allah, a new mother, was also executed by Muhammed. She was buried up to her waist and stoned to death due to her becoming pregnant outside of marriage (Sahih Muslim 1696 a).

Yes, the very same Muhammed that muslims are taught was the perfect man, and an 'excellent example' for all muslims to follow (33:21).

The islamic website islamonline.net writes of Muhammed:

'He was the best of the best; the ideal human being. May Allah's peace and blessings be upon him!'

Besides stoning women to death and ordering the killing of every gay man in Arabia and beyond, the ideal human being whom they refer to married a six year old girl, named Aisha, when he was fifty one, and consummated the marriage (had sexual intercourse with) the child when she was nine years old. She is reported to have still played with dolls. Muhammed was fifty four.

The marriage is recorded in the sahih (meaning authentic or of sound origin) hadith Sunan an-Nasa'i 3378, which reads as follows:

'It was narrated that 'Aishah said:

"The messenger of allah married me when I was six, and consummated the marriage with me when I was nine, and I used to play with dolls."

Again, this is the man whom muslims are taught is an 'excellent example', a man whom they ought to emulate. Muslims will not condemn any of Muhammed's actions, nor will they condemn any of their fellow muslims for participating in an action that Muhammed is also

reported to have participated in, regardless of whether the respective action is legal or seen as socially acceptable in their country of residence.

This is a major reason why the marriage of young, immature girls to adult men is somewhat commonplace, even socially acceptable, in muslim majority countries such as Afghanistan, Pakistan and Yemen.

As I write, the Iraqi parliament is moving to change the nation's Personal Status Law to transfer the responsibility for regulating marriages from Iraqi state courts to the country's islamic authorities, who aim to legalise the marriage of girls as young as nine years old.

According to msmagazine.com:

“The new law would give legal recognition to marriages of girls as young as 9 years old and remove criminal punishments for men who marry young girls—thereby legally authorizing the rape and sexual abuse of girls by adult men. The amendment would also remove protections for women in marriage, divorce and inheritance, which would likely increase already high rates of domestic violence.”

Finally, we shall briefly examine the taboo topic of slavery in islam. It is no secret that Muhammed, the quranic god's 'excellent example' for humankind, is recorded as having both kept and traded numerous slaves.

The sahih hadith Sunan an-Nasa'i 4184 recounts the story of a man approaching Muhammed in public and pledging to him his allegiance, promising that he would emigrate in the cause of allah (emigration is a prominent theme throughout the quran, see the ayat: 4:100, 8:74-75, 22:58-59).

Muhammed readily accepted his pledge (or *bay'ah*, meaning here to testify that there is no god worthy of worship but allah and that Muhammed is/was his messenger, and that you, the pledger, will submit yourself to islam in totality), but in a somewhat ironic turn of events it soon transpired that the new muslim was, in fact, a renegade slave.

The man's 'owner' hastily sought out Muhammed and demanded that his slave be returned to him. How did Muhammed, the one true god's greatest prophet, respond? Did he chastise the man for arrogantly and falsely believing that he could ever possibly own another human being? Did he deliver to the people of Mecca a sermon so inspired that the Arabs forthwith ceased their slave trading activities? Did he at least condemn the keeping of slaves?

Muhammed did none of the above. Instead, he simply said:

'Sell him to me'.

The slave master granted his wish, and the new convert was sold to the prophet in exchange for two of Muhammed's African slaves.

This hadith conveys to us that Muhammed had no qualms with keeping or trading male slaves. But what about the unfortunate females?

The sahih hadith Sunan an-Nasa'i 1125 reads as follows:

"It was narrated Aishah said:

"I noticed that the messenger of allah was missing and I thought he had gone to visit one of his concubines, so I looked for him and found him prostrating and saying: 'Rabbighfirli ma asrartu wa ma a'lant (O allah, forgive me for what (sin) I have concealed and what I have done openly).'"

This hadith is often overlooked by both scholars and critics alike when scrutinising islamic literature, yet it conveys to us one damning fact. That Muhammed kept concubines. More specifically, that Muhammed kept odeliques.

What exactly is an odelique?

Merriam Webster provides us with two definitions. The first of which defines an odelique as: 'an enslaved woman'.

The second defines an odelique as: 'a concubine in a harem'. The harem is the separate and exclusively female section of a muslim household where the man's wives usually reside and where his female slaves are confined.

So, an odelique is an enslaved woman who is kept captive against her will in a muslim man's private palace of pleasures to be used for his sexual gratification. In other words, Muhammed kept sex slaves.

This oughtn't to surprise anyone who is familiar with the quran, because in the book, allah (purportedly) talks at length about 'those whom your right hand possess' (4:3, 4:24, 70:30, 23:6, 16:71). This term is a euphemism for the female captives forced into domestic and sexual slavery by their muslim 'owners'.

Allah, in the ayah 33:50, demarcates whom he permits muslims to engage in sexual intercourse with. The ayah reads as follows:

"O Prophet! Lo! We have made lawful unto thee thy wives unto whom thou hast paid their dowries, and those whom thy right hand possesseth of those whom allah hath given thee as spoils of war...and a believing woman if she give herself unto the prophet and the prophet desire to ask her in marriage - a privilege for thee only, not for the (rest of) believers - We are aware of that which We enjoined upon them concerning their wives and those whom their right hands possess - that thou mayst be free from blame, for allah is ever forgiving, merciful."

Aside from condoning copulating with slave women (this is equivalent to rape, as the women in question are held captive against their will), this ayah is notable due to it being one of the many in which allah grants Muhammed special, and usually carnal, privileges. In this case, allah allows Muhammed the privilege of exceeding his divine decree of a maximum of four wives per muslim (4:3).

If Muhammed, who muslims are taught set an 'excellent example' to emulate, himself captured and kept sex slaves, are there muslims today, in the twenty first century, who

emulate their seventh century prophet in waging war against the kuffir and capturing their young girls and women for use as odeliques?

Unfortunately, the answer to the above question is a resounding **yes**. The infamous muslim militant groups such as I.S, Boko Haram, Hamas and many others have all justified their kidnapping of non-muslim females using the aforementioned ayat.

In 2018, The Montreal Gazette conducted an interview with a Syrian I.S defector. In the interview, the illiterate defector recounts his brief career as an I.S fighter and tells of how the captured Yezidi and christian women were kept in cells before being distributed amongst the jihadis for use as sex slaves.

The full interview can be found on YouTube under the title:

“A sex slave as a gift” from Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi’.

We in the west seem to have fooled ourselves into believing that islam is, and always was, inherently just and peaceful. This is a dangerous and erroneous belief.

Just as dangerous, and just as false, is the belief that islam has somehow changed since the time of Muhammed and Umar, and that islamic terrorist groups and militias such as I.S, the Taliban and Boko Haram have all simply misinterpreted the teachings of the quran, the sunnah and the sirah.

We hold these beliefs at our own peril.

- Joe Joyce Hynes